

REMARKS

The Examiner has delineated the following invention as being patentably distinct:

I. Claims 1-16 and 27 directed to an apparatus classified in class 118, subclass 715;
and

II. Claims 17-26, drawn to a method classified in class 427, subclass 248.1.

Applicant provisionally elects Group I, Claims 1-16 and 27, with traverse in view of the following arguments why all of the claims should be examined on the merits together.


The claims of Group I (1-16 and 27) are integrally linked with Claims 17-26 of Group II. The device of Group I must necessarily be used in order to practice the invention of Group II. Different classification does not necessitate different inventions. The claims as they now read are interdependent and should not be separated. The Examiner has failed to adequately distinguish or define different inventions.

In any event, in order to comply with the Examiner's request to the restriction requirement, Applicant provisionally elects Group I, Claims 1-16 and 27 with traverse.

If the invention of Group I (Claims 1-16 and 27) is found to be allowable, withdrawn method claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitation of the allowable claims shall be rejoined. MPEP 821.04.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Daniel R. Evans, Ph.D.
Registration No. 55,868

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)